Journal of the Korean Astronomical Society
00: 1 ∼ 99, 2016 September
©2016. The Korean Astronomical Society. All rights reserved.
http://dx.doi.org/10.5303/JKAS.2016.00.0.1
pISSN: 1225-4614 / eISSN: 2288-890X
http://jkas.kas.org

arXiv:1609.02919v2 [astro-ph.SR] 13 Sep 2016

Predicted Information Content of Gaia-Hipparcos

Andrew Gould[1,2,3] & Juna A. Kollmeier[4]

[1]Max-Planck-Institute for Astronomy, Königstuhl 17, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany; gould@astronomy.ohio-state.edu
[2]Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute, Daejon 305-348, Republic of Korea
[3]Department of Astronomy Ohio State University, 140 W. 18th Ave., Columbus, OH 43210, USA
[4]Observatories of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101

Received —; accepted —

Abstract: The Gaia-Tycho release, scheduled for 14 September, is forecast to yield parallax errors of $\sigma(\pi) \sim 300\,\mu$as for about 2 million Tycho stars. We show analytically that the actual performance should be

$$\sigma(\pi) = \max(\sigma_{1991}/96, 20\,\mu\text{as})$$

where σ_{1991} is the positional error from the Hipparcos mission. For typical Tycho stars, $\sigma_{1991} \sim 30$ mas, so this reproduces the usual claims. However, for the 100,000 star Hipparcos subset of this sample, σ_{1991} is a factor 15 or more smaller. These much lower Hipparcos positional errors apply even to stars at the Hipparcos-Tycho limit, $V \sim 12$. This is especially important for RR Lyrae stars, as well as other special classes, that were systematically included in the Hipparcos catalog down to this limit because of their exceptional scientific importance. This predicted performance will provide an early test of the Gaia algorithms.

Key words: astrometry

1. Introduction

On 14 September, Gaia will release parallax and proper motion measurements for roughly 2 million stars in the Tycho catalog. The release will be based on about 9 months of Gaia data, which normally would not be enough to disentangle the correlations between the three quantities, position P, proper motion μ, and parallax π. However, for Tycho stars, these degeneracies can be broken by the 1991 position measurements of the Hipparcos satellite. The "anticipated" parallax precision (no doubt highly influenced by the fact that the actual precisions are already known to the Gaia team) is $\sigma(\pi) \sim 300\,\mu$as. This release will enable a huge range of science, and also facilitate community preparation for the subsequent full Gaia releases.

However, as we show here, the information content of these observations is potentially much greater for the subset of these stars with Hipparcos data. These stars have much smaller positional errors than typical Tycho stars, even when they are at similar V magnitudes. We ourselves are motivated by the problem of calibrating RR Lyrae period-luminosity relations, a project that will greatly benefit from the much higher precision that we predict. This calibration will also pave the way to measuring the Gaia parallax zero point (Gould & Kollmeier, 2016). However, the same improved precision would greatly aid many other investigations as well.

Corresponding author: Andrew Gould

2. Analytic Gaia-Tycho Errors

In order to elucidate the basic issues, we consider a highly simplified case: three measurements of a star position, which lies in the ecliptic, two of which are taken $2\delta t = 6$ months apart at quadrature and the third is taken $\Delta t = 24$ yr previously. Let the errors for the two recent measurements both be σ, and let the error in the early measurement be σ_{1991}. For simplicity, we assume that the mean epoch of the early measurement is made at opposition. Then there are three equations and three unknowns:

$$P_{1991} = P - \mu\Delta t \pm \sigma_{1991} \tag{1}$$

$$P_- = P - \mu\delta t - \pi \pm \sigma \tag{2}$$

$$P_+ = P + \mu\delta t + \pi \pm \sigma \tag{3}$$

where P is the position at time $t = 0$, i.e., halfway between the times of the two recent measurements. Equations (2) and (3) can be written more compactly as $P_\pm = P \pm (\mu\delta t + \pi)$. Using standard techniques (e.g. Gould 2003) these equation yield the inverse covariance matrix b_{ij} for the variables (P, μ, π) is

$$b_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} w_{1991} + 2w & -w_{1991}\Delta t & 0 \\ -w_{1991}\Delta t & w_{1991}(\Delta t)^2 + 2w(\delta t)^2 & 2w\delta t \\ 0 & 2w\delta t & 2w \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where $w \equiv \sigma^{-2}$ and $w_{1991} \equiv \sigma_{1991}^{-2}$ Inverting this matrix yields $c \equiv b^{-1}$, and so,

$$\sigma^2(\pi) = c_{33} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\left(1 - \frac{(w_{1991} + 2w)(\delta t)^2}{2w(\delta t)^2 + w_{1991}((\Delta t)^2 + (\delta t)^2)}\right)^{-1}. \tag{5}$$

That is, after some algebra,

$$\sigma^2(\pi) = \sigma_{1991}^2 \left(\frac{\delta t}{\Delta t}\right)^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\left[1 + \left(\frac{\delta t}{\Delta t}\right)^2\right]. \quad (6)$$

Since $(\delta t/\Delta t)^2 \sim 10^{-4}$, Equation (6) is extremely well approximated by

$$\sigma(\pi) = \sqrt{\sigma_{1991}^2 \left(\frac{\delta t}{\Delta t}\right)^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}. \quad (7)$$

The simplicity of Equation (7) relative to Equations (4) and (5) implies that the problem contains symmetries that are not captured by the above brute-force analysis. These can be understood as follows. From the two recent measurements, we have $P = (P_+ + P_-)/2 \pm \sigma/\sqrt{2}$ and $(\mu\delta t + \pi) = (P_+ - P_-)/2 \pm \sigma/\sqrt{2}$, with the two quantities being completely uncorrelated. This implies that $\mu = (P - P_{1991})/\Delta t$ (with $[\sigma(\mu)\Delta t]^2 = \sigma^2/2 + \sigma_{1991}^2$) is also uncorrelated with the $(\mu\delta t + \pi)$ measurement, just above. Combining these two therefore yields Equation (6) (and so Equation (7)).

Now, if we assume that $\sigma_{1991}(\delta t/\Delta t) > \sigma$, then Equation (7) simplifies to

$$\sigma(\pi) = \sigma_{1991}\frac{\delta t}{\Delta t} = \frac{\sigma_{1991}}{96} \qquad (\text{large } \sigma_{1991}). \quad (8)$$

Hence, for typical Tycho stars, with $\sigma_{1991} = 30\,$mas, the expected parallax errors are $\sigma(\pi) \sim 300\,\mu$as. i.e., exactly the errors that are usually advertised for this catalog.

However, for stars in the Hipparcos catalog, σ_{1991} is dramatically smaller. Even for $V \sim 12$ (the faintest stars that were routinely targeted by Hipparcos, and also the effective limit of the Tycho catalog), $\sigma_{1991} \sim 2\,$mas, while for brighter stars it is typically a factor few smaller. Adopting this faint limit value, one finds $(\delta t/\Delta t)\sigma_{1991} = 20\,\mu$as. This is no longer large compared to σ and so we cannot simply apply Equation (8).

To make a rough estimate of what can be achieved for Hipparcos stars, we must derive an effective value of σ. First we note that for the mission as a whole, the Gaia website[1] gives

$$\sigma_{5\,\mathrm{yr}}(\pi) = (-1.631 + 680.766\,z + 32.732\,z^2)^{1/2} Q(V-I) \quad (9)$$

where $Q(V-I) \equiv [0.986 + 0.014(V-I)]$ and

$$z = \min(10^{0.4(G-15)}, 10^{-1.2}). \quad (10)$$

Since essentially all Hipparcos stars have $G < 12$, this equation simplifies considerably to

$$\sigma_{5\,\mathrm{yr}}(\pi) = 6.4\mu\text{as}. \quad (11)$$

Since the Gaia-Tycho release is based on just 9 months of data, we adopt $\sigma/\sqrt{2} \to 6.4 * \sqrt{60/9} = 16.5\,\mu$as. We discuss the role of this, and other simplifications we have made in Section 3, but the short answer is that none of these affect our basic argument.

Therefore, for the general case

$$\sigma(\pi) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sigma_{1991}}{96}\right)^2 + (16.5\,\mu\text{as})^2}. \quad (12)$$

Hence, for the case of faint ($V \sim 12$) Hipparcos stars with $\sigma_{1991} = 2\,$mas, we have $\sigma(\pi) = 27\,\mu$as.

3. ROLE OF APPROXIMATIONS

In order to derive the results of Section 2, we made a wide variety of approximations. We now examine their potential impact on these results.

First, we approximated the Gaia measurements as consisting of two observations at quadrature rather than a series of relatively random observations constrained by visibility due to Sun-exclusion. This would seem to vastly oversimplify the correlations that the real-sequence of measurements induces on the parallax and proper motion measurements. However, the *sign* of this effect goes in the wrong direction to give rise to concerns. That is, a real series of measurements over less than a year will induce some correlations – possibly quite severe – between π and μ. However, our simplification of two measurements actually induced *perfect* correlation between these variables. That is, there is good information about $(\mu\delta t + \pi)$ but absolutely zero information about μ and π separately. Thus, any real series of measurements will actually contain *more* information to separate π and μ than we have assumed.

Second, we have assumed that the target lies on the ecliptic. However, this only causes us to underestimate the amount of information about parallax. On average the true errors for a given time sequence of observations will be reduced by a factor $(1+\sin^2\beta)^{-1/2}$ where β is the ecliptic latitude. This correction is usually small, but in any case only improves the parallax precision relative to our estimates.

Third, we have estimated an effective σ by simple root-N scaling from the full mission, whereas the real leverage coming from 9 months of data will vary significantly over the sky. However, even if this leads to factor two variation in this effective σ, it does not alter the basic scaling of Equation (8) for the case that $(\delta t/\Delta t)\sigma_{1991}$ is large compared to this value. It only means that at some points on the sky, the limiting precision will be 50% lower than the $16.5\,\mu$as that we have estimated and in other parts of the sky, it will be 50% higher. The actual values of these errors for particular stars will be important for any particular application of the Gaia-Tycho catalog, but these variations do not impact the basic argument given here.

Fourth, we have assumed that the 2015 Gaia and the 1991 Hipparcos (or Tycho) positions are in the same global reference frame, whereas in fact these frames are established independently. Moreover, whereas Hipparcos (like Gaia) parallaxes are absolute, its positions and proper motions had to be aligned to a radio-quasar

[1] http://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/gaia/science-performance

based reference frame via a handful of radio stars. While the zero-point position error plays no role in the current study (because it induces errors that are an order of magnitude smaller than other inputs), the proper motion reference frame error can be significant.

Recall from the "heuristic" derivation of Equation (7) (which is mathematically identical to the rigorous derivation), that the proper motion is determined with precision $\sigma(\mu) = \sigma_{1991}/\Delta t$ (for the case of large σ_{1991}). The error in π is then $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\mu)\delta t$. However, if the reference frame itself has a systematic error $\delta\mu$, then this sets a floor $\sigma(\mu) \geq \delta\mu$, and hence a floor $\sigma\pi \geq \delta\mu\delta t \rightarrow 60\,\mu$as, where we have adopted $\delta\mu = 0.25\,\mathrm{mas\,yr^{-1}}$. This is still quite good, and in particular much better than the $300\,\mu$as errors for Tycho stars.

In fact, however, it should be possible to recover the full power of Equation (7). The proper-motion reference frame consists of three numbers, i.e., $\mathbf{\Omega}$, which give the rate of rotation of the reference frame relative to the "true" quasar frame. Consider first Hipparcos stars near the ecliptic. Each, of course, has two proper motion components, one of which can be taken to perpendicular to the ecliptic (and the other parallel). The first, by construction, is completely uncorrelated with the parallax, and so can be determined with high precision ($\sim 66\,\mu\mathrm{as\,yr^{-1}}$) from Gaia data alone. This can then be directly compared to the Gaia-Hipparcos proper motion for several 10^4 stars, which will yield the zero point of the Hipparcos proper motion frame for two of the three components to ($< 1\,\mu\mathrm{as\,yr^{-1}}$). Next, we consider stars at moderate ecliptic latitude, for which the parallax and proper motions are coupled in both directions. For an individual star, one can then determine the parallax from the parallactic motion in the direction with well-determined proper-motion zero point, Then, from this known parallax, one can determine the proper motion from Gaia-only data in the other direction (with somewhat larger parallactic motion), and so determine the proper motion in that direction, thereby calibrating the Hipparcos zero point in that direction as well Actually, this argument is made only to illustrate the information content of the data. In practice, one would simultaneously fit for the 3 Hipparcos proper-motion zero points $\mathbf{\Omega}$ together with all other parameters.

Finally, we have assumed that what Gaia measures are positions on the sky, whereas in fact the actual measurements are of relative separations of stars near the "basic angle" $\sim 106°$. All astrometric parameters are then derived by simultaneously solving a very large number of equations derived from these offset measurements. Within this same process, one must also solve for a large number of parameters that describe the spacecraft, including its orientation, small changes in the basic angle, and many others. Nothing of this process is in any way captured by our simple "three measurement" idealization. Moreover, the Gaia software for extracting these parameters (both science and engineering), was designed to operate on about 10^9 stars, whereas the Gaia-Tycho solutions are based on only 10^6 stars, of which only 10^5 have high-precision, Hipparcos, 1991-position measurements.

However, while we do not claim to be experts in these data reductions, the basic answer to these concerns is that the information flow for Gaia-Tycho (or, really, Gaia-Hipparcos) is nearly the same as for Hipparcos: same number of stars, same astrometric parameters, and basically same spacecraft parameters. The errors are smaller, but the mathematical treatment simply scales with these. The data stream is shorter, so there are different types of – and stronger – correlations between parameters from Gaia-only (compared to Hipparcos-only) measurements. However, because "Gaia-only" measurements are supplemented by first-epoch measurements from Hipparcos, the actual correlations between parameters are similarly small for Gaia+Hipparcos as for Hipparcos.

4. DISCUSSION

It may well be that when the Gaia-Tycho catalog is released, the reported errors will be roughly as predicted here. In this case, the main value of the present work will be to alert the community to the fact that much higher-precision science is possible than was thought based on pre-release advertisements. For example, typical Hipparcos RR Lyrae stars have parallaxes $\pi \sim 800\,\mu$as (e.g., Popowski & Gould 1998a). If the parallax measurements have errors of $\sigma(\pi) \sim 300\,\mu$as, then it will be possible to determine the zero-point of the period-luminosity (PL) relation to a precision of $(5/\ln 10)(300/800)/\sqrt{100} = 0.08\,$mag from a sample of 100 stars. This is really not qualitatively better than a number of previous determinations dating back more than 20 years (Longmore et al., 1990; Layden et al., 1996; Popowski & Gould, 1998a; Gould & Popowski, 1998; Benedict et al., 2011; Kollmeier et al., 2013; Madore et al., 2013; Dambis et al., 2014). On the other hand, if the precisions can be improved a factor 10, then the PL zero points will experience similar improvements. Moreover, such improvements would allow qualitatively different questions can be addressed. For example, the scatter about the PL relation could be investigated in field RR Lyrae stars, whereas currently this is only possible in (presumably more homogeneous) clusters.

On the other hand, if the errors reported in the Gaia-Tycho catalog are at the $300\,\mu$as level even for Hipparcos stars, then the analytic arguments presented here can be used to track down the discrepancy between these reports and our predictions. This may lead either to an improved catalog or to a deeper understanding of issues that will impact future Gaia releases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Amelia Stutz for valuable comments. This work was supported by NSF grant AST-1516842.

REFERENCES

Benedict, G. F., McArthur, B. E., Feast, M. W., et al. 2011, Distance Scale Zero Points from Galactic RR Lyrae Star Parallaxes, AJ, 142, 187

Dambis, A. K., Rastorguev, A. S., & Zabolotskikh, M. V. 2014, Mid-infrared period-luminosity relations for globular cluster RR Lyrae, MNRAS, 439, 3765
Gould, A. 2003, χ^2 and Linear Fits, arXiv:0310577
Gould, A. & Kollmeier, J.A. 2015, Gaia Parallax Zero Point From RR Lyrae Stars JKAS, submitted, arXiv:1609.00728
Gould, A. & Popowski, P. 1998, Systematics of RR Lyrae Statistical Parallax. III. Apparent Magnitudes and Extinctions, ApJ, 508, 844
Kollmeier, J. A., Szczygieł, D. M., Burns, C. R., et al. 2013, The Absolute Magnitude of RRc Variables from Statistical Parallax, ApJ, 775, 57
Layden, A.C., Hanson, R.B., Hawley, S.L., Klemola, A.R., & Hanley, C.J. 1996, The Absolute Magnitude and Kinematics of RR Lyrae Stars Via Statistical Parallax, AJ, 112, 2110
Longmore, A. J., Dixon, R., Skillen, I., Jameson, R. F., & Fernley, J. A. 1990, Globular cluster distances from the RR Lyrae log(period)-infrared magnitude relation , MNRAS, 247, 684
Madore, B. F., Hoffman, D., Freedman, W. L., et al. 2013, A Preliminary Calibration of the RR Lyrae Period-Luminosity Relation at Mid-infrared Wavelengths: WISE Data, ApJ, 776, 135
Popowski, P. & Gould, A. 1998, Systematics of RR Lyrae Statistical Parallax. II. Proper Motions and Radial Velocities, ApJ, 506, 271
Popowski, P. & Gould, A. 1998, Systematics of RR Lyrae Statistical Parallax. I. Mathematics, ApJ, 506, 259